

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application. Claims 13-23, which were withdrawn from consideration, have been cancelled. Claims 6 and 8 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the curing times and conditions from original Claims 6 and 8. The dependencies of Claims 9-12 have been corrected to depend on amended Claim 1. New Claim 24 has been added. New Claim 24 recites the mixture of octyl-decyl monoacrylate and pentaerythritol pentaacrylate as disclosed at Paragraph [0014] of the Specification. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the election portion of a compound B component in the interest of compact prosecution.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 8-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of original Claim 8 and intervening Claim 6. Claims 9-12 have been made to depend on Claim 1. New Claim 24 also depends on amended Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 1, 9-12, 24, and any intervening dependent claims should now be in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burns et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,506,823 and 2002/0132885). Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Diener et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,932,282). Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lahrmann et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,425,970). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants point out that Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of Claims 8 and 6, which the Examiner has held to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejections based on Burns et al., Diener et al., and Lahrmann et al. are now moot. Reconsideration and removal of the §102 rejections of the Claims are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 / 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Diener et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Diener et al. do not disclose Applicants' claimed invention as amended. Further, one skilled in the art would not arrive at Applicants' curing conditions based on a reading of Diener et al. as Diener et al. merely detail the UV flash lamps, successive UV flash discharges, and distances of the UV source from the substrate to provide the hardened coating. Column 5, line 54 to Column 6, line 4. Diener et al. do provide any instruction or direction as to the UV and curing parameters necessary to achieve a non-tacky surface according to Applicants' claimed invention as

amended. Reconsideration and removal of the §102 and §103 rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 10, 2007

By: Anna M. Budde
Anna M. Budde, Reg. No. 35,085

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/SDJ/tp